

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants requests favorable reconsideration of the subject application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action dated March 19, 2004, the Examiner objected to the disclosure and claim 2 because of informalities; claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Rymer; claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Lin et al. (273); claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ellingson (458); claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Rumberg (186); claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gates. The Examiner's Action also indicated that claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 to correct the informalities as the Examiner suggested. Claim 3 has been canceled and the allowable subject matter of claim 3 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 1-2 and 4-10 have

also been amended to remove reference numbers in accordance with the USPTO practice.

No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants submit that the subject application is patentable for the following reasons:

Objections

The specification and claim 2 are objected to because of informalities.

In response, Applicants have amended the specification and claim 2 as suggested in the Examiner's Office Action. Accordingly, the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Rymer; claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Lin et al. (273); claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ellingson (458); claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Rumberg (186); claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Applicants' admitted prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gates.

It is also indicated that claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants have canceled claim 3 and amended claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of the canceled claim 3 into claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Since claims 2 and 4-10 depend on claim 1, either directly or indirectly, claims 2 and 4-10 are also allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the above, all objections and rejections have been overcome and claims 1-2 and 4-10 as amended are in condition for allowance, early notice of which is requested. Should the present amendment not place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney to resolve any remaining issues.

No fee is believed to be due. Should any fee be required, please charge the same to deposit account no. 22-0261 and notify Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 21, 2004

Fei-Fei Chao (Reg. No. 43, 538)
Venable LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Tel.: 202-344-4000
Telefax: 202-344-8300

Doc# 557649